



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,423	03/30/2004	John J. Connors III	8627-452	4776

757	7590	01/24/2008
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE		
P.O. BOX 10395		
CHICAGO, IL 60610		

EXAMINER
SELLMAN, CACHET I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1792	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action After the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/813,423	CONNORS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cachet I. Sellman	1792	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

The reply filed 10/31/2007 is acknowledged.

1. ☐ The reply filed on or after the date of filing of an appeal brief, but prior to a final decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, will not be entered because:
 - a. ☐ The amendment is not limited to canceling claims (where the cancellation does not affect the scope of any other pending claims) or rewriting dependent claims into independent form (no limitation of a dependent claim can be excluded in rewriting that claim). See 37 CFR 41.33(b) and (c).
 - b. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is not timely filed before the filing of an appeal brief. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(2).
2. ☐ The reply is not entered because it was not filed within the two month time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.39(b), 41.50(a)(2), or 41.50(b) (whichever is appropriate). Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not available.

Note: This paragraph is for a reply filed in response to one of the following: (a) an examiner's answer that includes a new ground of rejection (37 CFR 41.39(a)(2)); (b) a supplemental examiner's answer written in response to a remand by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for further consideration of rejection (37 CFR 41.50(a)(2)); or (c) a Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences decision that includes a new ground of rejection (37 CFR 41.50(b)).
3. ☒ The reply is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
4. ☐ Other: _____

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/31/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues the Examiner's position on inherency when spraying an object with a material that unless you mask the object areas where the material is not desired will also receive the material. The Examiner would like to use "Spray Painting: Using an airless sprayer tips and tutorials (<http://alsnetbiz.com/homeimprovement/spraypainting.html>)," it shows that masking tape and lots of plastic to mask off areas not to be painted are needed. This shows that when spraying a material/ coating if there is a particular area that needs to be painted/sprayed that is must be masked off otherwise the material will need to be removed in a subsequent step. The Examiner will maintain its position that the material being sprayed on the proximal portion will inherently land on the distal portion since the Engelson reference does not teach the masking of the distal portion.
2. The applicant also states that the cleaning step of Engelson using the oxygen plasma would not inherently remove the undesired sprayed material on the distal end. However, as stated in the advisory action, the material being applied with the spray is a fluorocarbon and that using oxygen plasma etch will inherently remove the fluorocarbon because it is preformed prior to the application of the tie layer on the distal end of the wire guide.
3. The spraying of the fluorocarbon onto the wire guide which a portion lands on the distal end due to the lack of masking to prevent such meets the limitation of spraying the first layer on the distal end, the oxygen cleaning of the guidewire prior to receiving

Art Unit: 1792

the tie layer meets the removal of the first layer because as stated above, the oxygen plasma removes fluorocarbon therefore these limitations are met by the Engelson reference.

4. The rejections made by the Examiner in the previous office action is maintained therefore **claims 1-5 are rejected.**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cachet I. Sellman whose telephone number is 571-272-0691. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:00 - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cachet I Sellman

Application/Control Number: 10/813,423

Page 4

Art Unit: 1792

Examiner
Art Unit 1792

Cis

/William Phillip Fletcher III/
Primary Examiner